

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/658,337	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WACHA, WILLARD C.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Darren W. Ark	<b>Art Unit</b> 3643	

**All Participants:**

(1) Darren W. Ark.

(2) John Pietrangelo.

**Status of Application:** After Final

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 6 July 2006

**Time:** 4:30pm EST

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*Rejections in the Final Action mailed 6/7/2006*

**Claims discussed:**

*1, 16, 18, 23-25, and 31*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*Prior art of record*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**DARREN W. ARK**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant submitted a proposed amendment to claims 1 and 18 which recited "each of the plurality of spurs mounted to a side of the lip and tapering from a first end mounted to the lip to a second pointed end". Examiner stated that Orlik 2,900,754 discloses tapered spikes for bait (20) and Konomos 3,293,790 discloses spike like structures (23, 24). Examiner stated there is concern that the independent claims lack sufficient structural details to overcome the prior art of record. Examiner proposed amending claims 1 and 18 to recite that the strap extends along the longitudinal axis of the lip and body respectively. Examiner stated that although Marshall '931 discloses a strap (between 20 and 22) in Fig. 8, the strap of Marshall does not extend along the longitudinal axis or have longitudinally extending edges which both define the strap and extend above an upper surface of the lip. Examiner also stated that Marshall does not disclose the spurs positioned on opposed lateral sides of the lip where the molded material encases the hook or each of the spurs tapering from a first end to a second pointed end such that each spur projects from the molded material in a direction generally toward the front portion of the lip or body. The spurs of Marshall '931 are directed generally rearwardly and also do not taper from a first end to a second end. Konomos '790 does not disclose spurs which are directed toward the front of the lure. Orlik does not disclose any molded material encasing the hook and any portion of the lip or a punched out strap as proposed. Examiner proposed for claim 1 that the edges of the strap be recited such that they extend between the first and second ends, define the strap therebetween, and are raised above an upper surface of the lip in order to more accurately define the strap which could have been interpreted in the Marshall '931 strap (between 20, 22) as being oriented along the longitudinal axis since the strap has a width (between 20, 22) that extends along the axis and therefore meets the limitation. Examiner also modified Applicant's proposed language to the spurs so that it would have better form, but did not add any further limitations. Examiner proposed amendments to claim 18 which are similar in nature to that of claim 1. Examiner also proposed to cancel claims 23 and 24 since the hook recited in these claims is already recited in claim 18. Examiner proposed to cancel claim 25 since claim 18 already claims the strap. Applicant agreed to the proposed amendment. Please see the Examiner's Amendment for further details.